## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

•

LINDA J. BLOZIS, : CIVIL ACTION NO. 05-891 (SLR)

Plaintiff, :

VS.

MELLON TRUST OF DELAWARE,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION; MELLON
BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION;
MELLON FINANCIAL CORPORATION,

Defendants.

:

#### **DEFENDANTS' PROPOSED JURY INTERROGATORIES**

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

#### Single Employer Issue

1.	Has Plaintiff proven by the preponderance of the evidence that a functional integration of operations existed between Mellon Trust of Delaware, Mellon Bank N.A., and Mellon Financial Corporation?		
	YES		
	NO		
	Proceed to question #2.		

2.	Has Plaintiff proven by the preponderance of the evidence that Mellon Bank, N.A., and Mellon Financial Corporation centrally controlled the labor relations of Mellon Trust of Delaware?		
	YES		
	NO		
	Proceed to question #3.		
3.	Has Plaintiff proven by the preponderance of the evidence that common management existed between Mellon Trust of Delaware and/or Mellon Bank, N.A. and Mellon Financial Corporation?		
	YES		
	NO		
	Proceed to question #4.		
4.	Has Plaintiff proven by the preponderance of the evidence that a common ownership existed between Mellon Trust of Delaware and Mellon Bank, N.A. and Mellon Financial Corporation?		
	YES		
	NO		
	Proceed to question #5.		
5.	Has Plaintiff proven by the preponderance of the evidence that Mellon Bank, N.A or Mellon Financial Corporation financially controlled Mellon Trust of Delaware?		
	YES		
	NO		
	Proceed to question #6.		
6.	Has Plaintiff proven by the preponderance of the evidence, in light your answers above, that a single employer relationship existed between Mellon Trust of Delaware and Mellon Bank, N.A., and Mellon Financial Corporation?		
	YES		
	NO		

If you have found that a single employer exists, please proceed to Jury Verdict Form #1.1 If you have not found that a single employer exists, then you must find for Defendants and go no further.

<sup>1</sup> Form #1 is attached.

#### **JURY VERDICT FORM #1**

### I. Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA)

1. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she was qualified for the Portfolio Administrator position from which she was terminated?		
YesNo		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendants and go no further.		
2. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she was terminated from her position with Mellon?		
Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendants and go no further.		
3. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Laur Shannon, a Portfolio Administrator, was substantially younger than Plaintiff?	а	
Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.		
4. Do you find that Mellon has articulated a legitimate, non-discriminatory reason for terminating Ms. Blozis?		
Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then go onto question 7.		

5. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Mellon's explanation for terminating her is really a pretext for age discrimination?		
YesNo		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.		
6. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she was not terminated because of poor job performance?		
Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.		
7. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she was not terminated for any other legitimate, non-discriminatory reason?		
Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.		
II. Title VII Claim (Sex Discrimination)		
8. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she was qualified for the Portfolio Administrator position from which she was terminated?		
Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.		

9. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she was terminated from her position with Mellon?	
YesNo	
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no" then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.	
10. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that her position was filled by a male Portfolio Administrator, that she was replaced by a male Portfolio Administrator or that a similarly situated male Portfolio Administrator was treated better than she?	
YesNo	
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.	
11. Do you find that Mellon has articulated a legitimate, non-discriminatory reason for terminating Ms. Blozis?	
Yes No	
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then go onto question 14.	
12. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Mellon's explanation for terminating her is really a pretext for sex discrimination?	
YesNo	
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.	
13. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she was not terminated because of poor job performance?	

Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.		
14. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she was not terminated for any other legitimate, non-discriminatory reason?		
Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.		

#### III. **ADEA Claim: Retaliation**

15. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she engaged in an activity protected by the ADEA?		
YesNo		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.		
16. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that there was a causal connection between the alleged protected activity and the termination of her employment?		
Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.		
17. Do you find that Mellon has articulated a legitimate, non-discriminatory reason for terminating Ms. Blozis?		
Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then go onto question 19.		
18. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Mellon's explanation of terminating her is really a pretext for retaliation?		
Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for Defendant and go no further.		

19. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she was not terminated because of poor job performance?		
Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.		
20. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Mellon terminated her because she engaged in protected activity and not because of any other legitimate, non-discriminatory reason?		
YesNo		
If "yes", then you must consider the following questions. If "no", then you must find for the Defendant and go no further.		
IV. Damages		
21. If you find that Plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant terminated her employment because of her age, sex, or in retaliation for complaining about age discrimination has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she is entitled to an award of back pay from Mellon? (You may answer this questions only if you answered "yes" to questions 7, 14 or 20). Note: Plaintiff's back pay award may extend only from July 19, 2004 until the date you provided an answer to this question.		
YesNo		
If "yes", how much backpay do you award?		
\$		

22. If you find that Plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant terminated her because of her age, sex, or in retaliation for complaining about age discrimination, did Plaintiff satisfy her duty of mitigating her damages by making reasonable efforts to find substantially equivalent employment after July 19, 2004?

		Yes No	
any back pay	If "yes y dama	s", go to the next question. If "no", then goes and go to question 28.	you may not award Plaintiff
damages, ho		If you find that Plaintiff made reasonab th has Plaintiff earned since her termina	
		\$	
diligence to f duty to mitiga		maintain substantially equivalent employ	
		Yes No	
	If "yes	s," go to the next question. If "no," then	go to question 26.
diligence?	25.	How much could Plaintiff have earned	if she had exercised
		\$	
since her ter	26. minatio	Taking into account how much Plaintiff on, whichever is greater, to how much ba	
	(a)	Amount of gross back pay: (Add Answ	er from Question 21)
			\$
	(b)	Amount Plaintiff Earned (answer from C Earned (answer from Question 25) whi	Question 23 or Could have ichever is greater.
			\$
	(c)	Total net back pay (a minus b)	\$

27. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Mellon's conduct was willful, that is, that Defendant knew or recklessly disregarded whether its conduct was prohibited by the ADEA.		
YesNo		
If "yes", how much liquidated damages do you award?		
\$		
28. Only if you find that Plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant terminated her employment because of sex discrimination, has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that there is a substantial basis for an award of emotional distress damage? You are not to consider any award of emotion distress damages for Plaintiff's claims of age discrimination under the ADEA or age retaliation under the ADEA.		
Yes No		
If "yes", go to the next question. If "no", then you may not award Plaintiff any emotional distress damages and go to question 29.		
If you find that Plaintiff is entitled to emotional distress damages, how much emotional distress damages is Plaintiff entitled.		
\$		
29. If you find that Plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant terminated her employment because of sex discrimination, has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Mellon's conduct was wantonly reckless, malicious and willfully disregarded her rights?		
Yes No		
If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must not award Plaintiff any punitive damages and go to question		
30. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she is entitled to punitive damages?  Yes No		

If "yes", go onto the next question. If "no", then you must not award Plaintiff any punitive damages and go to question 32.

31. If you find that Plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages, how much punitive damages is Plaintiff entitled?

\$

32. The total amount of damages for Plaintiff are (add amount of net damages award from questions 26(c), 27, 28, 31 above, if any):

\$\_\_\_\_\_

[Your deliberations now have ended, have all jurors sign on the last page, and notify the Court Officer.]

# THE FOREGOING IS THE VERDICT OF THE JURY EACH JUROR MUST SIGN BELOW

Juror
Juror
Juror
Juror